



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/711,152

08/27/2004

Martin PETERSSON

7589.197.PCUS00

5151

65858

7590

03/03/2009

NOVAK DRUCE AND QUIGG LLP (Volvo)

1000 LOUISIANA STREET

FIFTY-THIRD FLOOR

HOUSTON, TX 77002

EXAMINER

MERKLING, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/711,152		Applicant(s) PETERSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner MATTHEW J. MERKLING		Art Unit 1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MATTHEW J. MERKLING. (3) ____.

(2) Kenneth M. Fagin. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 26 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, 19 and 31.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ogata, Kusakabe, Binke, Van Andelr.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Fagin presented arguments regarding how the prior art (Ogata and Van Andel) do not disclose the limitations of claim 11 and how the prior (Kusakabe and Binker) do not disclose the limitations of claim 31. Mr. Fagin suggested that these arguments will be submitted in a request for reconsideration. The examiner indicated that such arguments will be taken into consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/M. J. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 1795	/Alexa D. Neckel/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795
---------------------------------------	---